DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 725 HE 035 824

AUTHOR	McGuinness, Aims, Jr.
TITLE	Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education: A Supplement to "Measuring Up 2000." National Center Report.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, CA.
REPORT NO	R-00-6
PUB DATE	2000-12-00
NOTE	66p.; For the "Measuring Up 2000" report, see ED 450 633.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 152 North Third Street, Suite 705, San Jose, CA 95112. Tel: 408-271-2697; Fax: 408-271-2697; e-mail: center@highereducation.org. For full text: http://www.highereducation.org.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Diversity (Student); Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Educational Trends; *Higher Education; *State Action
IDENTIFIERS	*Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This paper presents observations on a nationwide review of recent state education policy initiatives. The intent of the review was to identify initiatives that have been implemented since most of the data in the "Measuring Up 2000" report were collected, roughly academic year 1997-1998. The review emphasized higher education but did examine the scope of educational initiatives from early childhood through adult education. The review did not focus on trends in levels of state funding for higher education. Findings show that a number of states have undertaken significant new policy initiatives since 1997-1998 that could have effects on future educational performance. A subtle shift is taking place in a small subset of states from a focus on institutions to a focus on the state's population. This change is reflected in strategies aimed at increasing the educational attainment of the state's population. In a majority of states, however, higher education policy remains focused on internal concerns and institutional priorities. Findings also show a clear distinction between states and initiated education reforms in the late 1980s and early 1990s and have sustained those reforms and states that did not. State policy initiatives identified were grouped into 10 categories: (1) major reform initiatives; (2) K-16 initiatives at the state level; (3) major initiatives, primarily for higher education; (4) major P-12 initiatives; (5) teacher quality initiatives; (6) major community college initiatives; (7) major policy changes in student financing; (8) major changes in institutional financing; (9) new delivery systems, technology, and distance learning initiatives; and (10) other major higher education policy initiatives. An appendix summarizes state policy initiatives in education since 1997-1998 in table form. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 475 725

Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education: A Supplement to "Measuring Up 2000"

Aims McGuinness, Jr.
The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education

December 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Jack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

HE 035 824

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education

A Supplement to *Measuring Up 2000*

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR
PUBLIC POLICY AND
HIGHER EDUCATION

LB2331.72

Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education

A Supplement to *Measuring Up 2000*

By Aims McGuinness, Jr.

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

December 2000

NATIONAL CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

National Center Report #00-6

© 2000 by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education
Material may be duplicated with full attribution.

Contents

Foreword ..... *iv*

Overview of State Policy Initiatives Since 1997/98 1
Methodology 12

Appendix:
A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98 13

About the Author 57
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) 57
National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 58

Foreword

Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education was commissioned by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education as a supplement to *Measuring Up 2000: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education.*

Measuring Up 2000 uses the most recent data available, which in most cases is the 1997/98 academic year. *Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education,* researched and written by Aims McGuinness of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), provides information about education initiatives that states have adopted since 1997/98—initiatives that could improve state results in subsequent editions of *Measuring Up.* Not all states or initiatives have been included in this report; those that have been highlighted were selected by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems because of their importance in shaping policy and performance.

The National Center welcomes the comments of readers.

Joni E. Finney
Vice President
The National Center for Public Policy
and Higher Education

This paper presents observations on a nationwide review of recent state education policy initiatives. The intent of the review is to identify initiatives that have been implemented since most of the data for the National Center's report card, *Measuring Up 2000*, were collected—roughly academic year 1997/98. While an effort was made to examine state policy initiatives broadly, particular attention was given to those that could be reasonably related to or have a significant future impact on the major performance categories of preparation, participation, affordability, completion and benefits.

Several assumptions or perspectives are reflected in the review:

- The review emphasized higher education but purposely examined the full scope of state education initiatives from early childhood through adult education and literacy. Attention to K–12 initiatives stressed those that focus on preparation for higher education and narrowing gaps in access created by problems at the K–12 level.
- The review did not focus on trends in levels of state funding for higher education. Clearly, this is an important dimension of what has been happening in the states since 1997/98, but not all changes related to the level of state funding. While some of the changes can be attributed to strong economic conditions, others in states such as North Dakota, South Dakota and West Virginia took place in difficult state fiscal environments.

Overall observations

A number of states have undertaken significant new policy initiatives since 1997/98 that will not show up in *Measuring Up 2000* but could clearly affect future performance. Several other points stand out:

- A subtle shift is taking place in a small subset of states from a focus primarily on institutions to a broader focus on the state's population. This change is reflected in deliberate, integrated strategies to raise the education attainment of the state's population (both youth and adults) and the state's overall economic competitiveness. At the highest levels of leadership, these states have established clear, measurable goals for long-term change, and the whole system (not just K–12 or higher education) is engaged in making measurable progress toward these goals. In a majority of states, however, higher education policy remains focused on internal concerns and institutional priorities.
- There is a clear distinction between states that initiated education reforms in the late 1980s and early 1990s and have sustained those reforms, and those states that did

not. Even in states with long-standing reforms (e.g., Georgia, North Carolina and Maryland), significant changes in policy in the past three to five years could affect performance. In other states, the recently adopted reforms—especially in K–12—are so new and so clearly hastily copied from other states that it would be difficult to project how they will actually be implemented and whether they can be sustained long enough to have a fundamental impact.

- It is difficult—if not misleading—to focus on individual policy initiatives without a sense of their relationship (or lack of relationship) to other initiatives. To do so can reinforce political fragmentation and lack of alignment and integration. At all levels, but especially at the K–12 level, states are increasingly attempting to establish integrated, systematic reforms in which key elements (e.g., standards, assessment, accountability for schools and teachers, teacher quality, financing, leadership development) are aligned. At the higher education level, there is a clear pattern in a limited subset of states to link key policy elements (public policy priorities, student and institutional financing, accountability, and major technology and economic development initiatives). In the majority of states, however, higher education policy elements remain largely unaligned with a long-term strategy to improve education opportunity and attainment in the state.

State policy initiatives were grouped in ten broad categories. The appendix of this overview presents a summary of initiatives by state and category. The following is a description of the meaning of each category and examples of the major initiatives.

1. Major reform initiatives, all education levels (K–16)

Included in this category are state initiatives that reflect deliberate design at the highest level of state government (often through state legislation) to link K–12 and higher education reform. This category is distinguished from K–16 initiatives (category 2) by the level and pervasiveness of the K–16 emphasis—the emphasis is not subordinated to the priorities in either K–12 or higher education.

Three states (Florida, Georgia and North Carolina) have implemented—or are still in the process of implementing—changes instituted since 1997/98 that broaden and deepen the K–16 emphasis already existing in those states. To varying degrees, the changes include establishing a state-level leadership/accountability structure for all levels of education, and major initiatives in most of the other categories of policy initiative identified in this review (e.g., K–16, higher education, K–12, teacher quality, student and institutional financing, new delivery modes, and economic development).

As suggested earlier, it is difficult in these states to focus only on specific initiatives (e.g., HOPE Scholarships in Georgia), because each initiative fits within a broader policy framework and strategy. This integration is most evident in Georgia and North Carolina. The recent changes in Florida were designed to achieve greater coordination.

- Recent changes in Florida—which tend to be separate initiatives—include:
  - Major governance change creating a new state board of education effective January 2003.
  - Talented 20 initiative as an alternative to affirmative action whereby students in the top 20 percent of their graduating classes are to be guaranteed admission. Also, the need for alternatives in a "post-Hopwood" environment is driving more attention to early intervention and preparation for college.
  - The A+ education reform plan.
  - Florida Bright Futures, modeled after Georgia HOPE scholarships, initiated in 1997.
  - Initiatives on new modes of delivery, technology and economic development.
- Recent changes in Georgia that extend and institutionalize the reforms initiative over the past decade include:
  - The recently enacted (2000) education reforms establishing a new Education Coordinating Council and Office of Education Accountability providing a coordinating mechanism chaired by the governor, and drawing together all the state's education agencies and boards.
  - The P–16 Council and related initiatives of the University System of Georgia, Department of Education, Department of Technical and Adult Education, and other entities.
  - A wide range of policy initiatives of the University System of Georgia framed by guiding principles adopted by the Board of Regents in 1994.
  - Refinement of the HOPE Scholarship program and PROMISE scholarships related to teaching, including removal of the "Pell grant offset" in HOPE.
  - Major changes in the budget and resource allocation policies to link financing with state and university system priorities.
  - New modes of delivery and extensive initiatives related to technology.
  - Major new initiatives on economic development, including the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (ICAPP).

- As in Georgia, the recent changes in North Carolina build upon and extend previous initiatives—some pursued for several decades—to improve education at all levels in the state. These include:
  - The goal of making North Carolina's public schools *First in America* by the year 2010, led by the Education Cabinet including the leaders of all the state's major education entities.
  - The University of North Carolina's University-School Partnerships, a statewide strategy engaging the University in improving public education (improving teacher quality, school leadership, etc.).
  - Strategic priorities of the University emphasizing the university/school partnerships as well as initiatives on access, technology and partnerships for economic development.
  - A new strategic plan for the community college system emphasizing workforce development and leveraging the power of technology.
  - Significant changes in University of North Carolina (UNC) student financing policies, including a significant increase in tuition (a change from the historic commitment to low tuition) and the establishment of a new need-based student aid program for UNC students.
  - Major initiatives to extend information technology throughout the university and education system and to use technology for new modes of delivery and to improve teaching and learning.

2. K–16 INITIATIVES AT THE STATE/SYSTEM LEVEL

Beyond Florida, Georgia and North Carolina, the concept of P–16 or K–16 clearly is moving from concept to strategy and implementation in several states, and these changes have gained momentum since 1997/98. States that stand out in this category include Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas and Utah. These states share certain characteristics:

- A coordinating mechanism has been established at the state level to engage both political and education leaders from all sectors in a coordinated, long-term strategy to improve education in the state. These "mechanisms" tend *not* to be new

governance or administrative structures but are means to ensure coordination among highly diverse, separately governed entities.

- Efforts are being made to align key elements of reform across K–12 and higher education (e.g., standards, assessment, school accountability, teacher quality, financing, targeting of resources and support on high-need schools and populations). As emphasized by Michael Kirst, however, a serious gap remains between content and assessment standards between secondary education and higher education, and only a few state's K–16 initiatives are seriously narrowing this gap.[1]
- New initiatives combining the federal GEAR UP program, modified versions of the Georgia HOPE Scholarship program with more emphasis on targeting low-income students, and targeted efforts to strengthen preparation for college, especially in mathematics, reading and core subjects.
- A noticeable shift away from a focus on institutions (providers) toward an emphasis on raising the education attainment of the population. Oklahoma's new "Brain Gain" initiative is an example of this change.
- As in Florida, Georgia and North Carolina, the states in category 2 tend to have put in place multiple initiatives across all the categories in this review. There is a trend toward linking separate initiatives in an overall strategy, but this is more evident in some states than in others.
- In the case of Texas—as in Florida—the renewed attention to links with K–12 and a focus on preparation for college clearly is related to the need for alternatives in a "post-Hopwood" environment.

3. Major Initiatives, Primarily Higher Education

Each of the states mentioned in categories 1 and 2 also have undertaken major reforms specifically in higher education in the period since 1997/98. In addition, several other states recently have made changes—or are in the process of considering changes—which could affect future performance. Examples include:

- North Dakota: The recently approved North Dakota Roundtable report on the University System for the 21st Century, parts of which will require legislative action.

---

[1] Michael W. Kirst, "Overcoming the High School Senior Slump: New Education Policies," paper prepared for the National Commission on the Senior Year in High School, Stanford University, August 2000, p. 7.

- West Virginia: The recently approved higher education reform legislation establishing a Compact for the Future of West Virginia, creating a new financing system and a new Higher Education Policy Commission.

4. Major P–12 initiatives

Because this review is focused primarily on higher education, P–16 or K–12 reform initiatives were identified primarily to provide a context—especially in terms of the growing emphasis on K–16 reform. Because others are following these developments (e.g., Education Week, *Quality Counts*, and Achieve, Inc.), only brief summaries of major changes are included, and not all states' initiatives are noted.

The 1997/98 period has witnessed a new phase of K–12 reform that has direct relevance to the whole issue of preparation for college—and the related issue of accessibility for all students. In this period all but a few states have either established new K–12 reform agendas or enacted new agendas reflecting a common set of themes most clearly enunciated in the 1999 National Education Summit.

There is growing evidence that states that instituted similar reforms in the early periods (1985 to 1989), and sustained attention to these reforms, now are showing measurable improvements in NAEP results. The message is increasingly clear that sustained attention to an agenda emphasizing clear, measurable goals and benchmarks, standards, assessments aligned to standards, and consequences for students and schools, pays off in terms of improved performance over time.

As suggested earlier, many of the state K–12 reforms are so new (enacted in 1999/2000) that it would be difficult to project how they will be implemented and whether they will be sustained. Many of the new assessment policies are being phased in over the next three to five years. Several states have established new high school exit exams (exams that students must pass in order to receive a high school diploma) but in most cases these are just now affecting graduating students.

If these K–12 reforms have the intended impact on student achievement, they could have a significant impact on future state performance as measured by *Measuring Up 2000*.

5. Teacher quality initiatives

Teacher quality is a major issue in most states. As in the case of other K–12 related reforms, this review does not address them in detail because others (e.g., Education Week, *Quality Counts 2000*) are following these developments. Nevertheless, these initiatives—many of which are new—could significantly affect state higher education performance in the future. Improved

teacher quality should ultimately improve state performance on preparation for college. However, the current teacher quality initiatives also are placing strong emphasis on improving the education of teachers and on measuring what teachers know and can do prior to entering practice. The results of these assessments provide a means also for assessing the outcomes of undergraduate education at the colleges and universities from which the teachers graduated.

6. Major Community College Initiatives

Several states have enacted major reforms in the period since 1997/98 aimed at strengthening community colleges, technical education, and workforce development. These reforms could affect future state performance on access, affordability and other measures. The most prominent of these reforms are:

- *Indiana*. The statewide community college initiative involving Vincennes University and Ivy Tech.
- *Kansas*. The 1999 legislation assigning responsibility for coordination of the state's community colleges and postsecondary vocational schools to the Board of Regents.
- *Kentucky*. The Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS), established by HB 1 in 1997.
- *Louisiana*. The Louisiana Community and Technical College System, established in 1998.
- *Maine*. The Community College Partnership of Maine between the University of Maine System and the Maine Technical Colleges established in 2000 to ensure access to associate degree programs and technical college campuses.
- *Missouri*. The Postsecondary Technical Education statewide plan strengthening the role and mission of community colleges and other institutions providing access to postsecondary technical education in every region of the state.
- *West Virginia*. The new reform legislation (2000) calling for independently accredited community colleges in every region at the end of a six-year Compact for the Future of West Virginia.

7. Major Policy Changes in Student Financing

Included in this category are state initiatives focused on increasing affordability, including changes in both tuition policy (e.g., capping or reducing tuition) and new student aid policies. As indicated earlier, this review did not examine major changes in the levels of state funding for

student assistance—although certainly these changes will directly affect access and affordability and future state performance on *Measuring Up 2000*. This review focused on substantive changes in state policies. Several developments are reflected in the detailed summary:

- In the period since 1997/98, programs modeled after the Georgia HOPE Scholarship program have been the most popular student aid initiative in states across the nation. The most significant trend, however, has been to target the scholarships on lower-income students. The most dramatic change in this respect is the recent (August 2000) agreement between California Governor Gray Davis and the Legislature to increase state spending on need-based student aid by $97 million—enough to support a 41 percent increase in the number of grants awarded in the 2000-01 academic year. In addition, the agreement provides for nearly doubling spending on the state's need-based aid program, to $1.2 billion, by 2006. Under the agreement, the awards would be guaranteed to every student who qualified, rather than being based on how much money was available in the budget.

  Senate Bill 1644 revamps California's current statewide financial aid program, the Cal Grant Program, creating an entitlement program guaranteeing a grant or scholarship award to future California high school graduates who demonstrate financial need and earn at least a C grade point average in their high school course work. Beginning in 2001, high school graduates with financial need and at least a B average would be eligible for a full-tuition grant at a state institution, or up to $9,700 at a private college in the state. Needy students who have at least a C average would be eligible for up to $1,550 to cover living expenses. In addition, the legislation provides grants for older students who are returning to college or enrolling for the first time.

  Senate Bill 1688 provides financial awards of up to $5,500 for college costs to those high school students who are the highest scorers on the state's standardized STAR examinations and on Advanced Placement examinations in mathematics and science. The program would provide $1,000 scholarships to students with high scores on a statewide standardized test (STAR), and $2,500 grants to students with high scores on Advanced Placement tests in math and science.

- California was not the first state, however, to increase the emphasis on need in the design of new scholarship programs. Georgia's elimination of the "Pell-offset" in 2000 reflects this trend. The new programs in states such as Kentucky, Indiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas and Washington all have provisions to target funding and establish income limits for eligibility.

- Several states are developing new integrated student assistance and service strategies linking student aid programs (including the new HOPE-like scholarship

programs), improving preparation for college for target schools and populations, and strengthening information and counseling services. The federal GEAR UP program is a major catalyst for several of these initiatives. Indiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Washington are examples of these developments.

- Capping (if not reducing) public tuition, or curbing the rate of increase. Connecticut capped tuition for two fiscal years but in 2000 the state had to abandon that policy because of restrictions in state funding imposed by the state Constitution. Nevertheless, the state enacted a major increase in funding of state need-based student financial assistance, and the institutions agreed to restrain the rate of tuition increases.
- Incentives for accelerated postsecondary education completion. Utah established a unique variation of the HOPE Scholarship idea in the New Century Scholars program. Students who complete an associate degree prior to or shortly after completing high school will receive free tuition. The aim of the program is to provide incentives for students to accelerate their progress toward a higher education degree and thereby increase the capacity of the state to accommodate the projected massive increase in student demand over the next decade.
- Major changes in tuition and student aid policy. The clearest example of such a change is in North Carolina. After extensive study and debate, the University of North Carolina adopted a new tuition policy increasing tuition at some campuses and establishing lower rates at others. On the recommendation of the university, the Legislature in 2000 established a new need-based student aid program for UNC students.

8. MAJOR CHANGES IN INSTITUTIONAL FINANCING

Included in this category are state initiatives to reform the bases for allocating state funding to institutions, especially changes that link financing to public priorities. Joseph Burke has recently completed a review of performance funding and budgeting,[2] so this review did not attempt to examine that issue in depth. This review, however, found a continuing interest in "performance" as an element of institutional financing policy—but not as an initiative isolated from broader financing strategy. The more common pattern is of policy changes that link the budget to state strategic priorities ("performance budgeting," in Burke's terminology). In most cases, these changes are being accompanied by fundamental changes in the overall budgeting

[2] Joseph Burke et al., *Performance Funding and Budgeting: An Emerging Merger: Fourth Annual Survey* (2000).

and resource allocation policies. Examples of states making such changes in the period since 1997/98 (or shortly before) include:

- Georgia
- Kentucky
- Illinois
- North Dakota
- Oklahoma
- South Dakota
- West Virginia

Missouri, which has had the Funding for Results policy in place since the early 1990s, is continuing to refine this program to strengthen the link with state strategic priorities.

9. New delivery systems, technology and distance learning initiatives

The emphasis of this category is on state initiatives designed to increase access to regions, place-bound adults or other under-served populations through the use of new modes of delivery, open/distance learning and/or information technology. Four kinds of state initiative should be highlighted:

- The Kentucky Commonwealth Virtual University is an entity that provides access to, and brokers the offerings of, public institutions in Kentucky. It is also a means of ensuring that people in Kentucky have access to courseware and programs from other providers, and for certifying learning and granting its own degrees.
- State consortia designed to provide learners throughout a state with access to the programs and courseware of the state's institutions, and also to provide a wide range of information and support services for learners. Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, South Dakota and Utah are examples of these initiatives.
- Learning centers designed to provide communities or regions of a state with access to higher education services from multiple providers without establishing a new freestanding institution. In some cases, the providers are primarily the state's public institutions. In other cases, the centers are being designed deliberately as "open-provider" centers with the base infrastructure (student services, technology and capacity to identify and broker needs of clients in the region) to draw on multiple public and private, in-state and out-of-state providers. Oklahoma is an example of a statewide policy framework for developing learning centers. Developing centers also

has been a major issue in California, Illinois, Maryland, New Mexico, North Dakota and Oregon, among other states.

- Developing state policies (primarily financing and quality assurance) to provide incentives for institutions to deliver programs on other institutions' campuses (e.g., delivery of baccalaureate and graduate programs on community college campuses), or for institutions to serve as delivery sites for multiple providers. Florida and Oklahoma provide examples of these initiatives.

10. Other major higher education policy initiatives

Included in this category are state initiatives related to economic development or other public purposes not reflected in the other nine categories.

Summary

The period since 1997/98 has seen significant changes in state policy that may be too recent to be reflected in *Measuring Up 2000*. This review suggests that many of the most important changes have not taken place in *higher education policy*, but in broader initiatives cutting across all levels of education. In several states, the initiatives that may impact future performance (e.g., on preparation for college) have occurred outside higher education—and in fact, no significant changes have taken place explicitly in higher education policy in the past three to five years.

Methodology

As indicated, this review sought to identify state initiatives roughly since 1997/98. Data were gathered from a variety of sources:

1) The state-by-state files at the National Center compiled by Cerena Sweetland-Gil.
2) Review of readily available compilations of state initiatives such as:
   - *Education Week* state profiles, *Quality Counts,* and state news reports.
   - *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* including the September 1, 2000 *Almanac* and reports on state issues.
   - State profiles on state implementation of the 1999 National Education Summit developed by Achieve, Inc.
   - State-by-state reports and policy monitoring documents of the regional compacts, especially WICHE (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education) and SREB. This included the SREB Education Benchmarks 2000 reports.
   - National reports on state financing, tuition policy and student aid (e.g., SHEEO NASSGP survey and Washington HECB tuition survey).
   - State-by-state policy initiative summaries prepared by SHEEO and ECS.
3) Review of documents on state Web sites, including higher education and K–12 boards and agencies, governors' offices and legislatures, as necessary.
4) Review of other National Center reports providing a state-by-state perspective on policy initiatives.
5) Interviews with state officials in approximately 25 states.

Appendix

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Education Since 1997/98

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	**Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels**	**K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level**	**Major Higher Education Initiatives**	**Major P–12 Initiatives**	**Teacher Quality Initiatives**	**Major Community College Initiatives**	**Major Policy Changes in Student Financing**	**Major Changes in Institutional Financing**	**New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives**	**Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives**
AL		Feedback from higher education to high schools is used as an element of the state's accountability system for secondary education.	Major priority given to review of existing academic programs resulting in a reduction over the past five years from 3,200 to 1,781 active programs, and the reallocation of resources to strengthen other programs.	Governor Seigelman in 1999 gained approval of initiatives to lower K–3 class size, strengthen professional development, and a reading initiative (see next column). In March 1999, tenth graders will become the first students to take new high school exit exam. New exam is aligned with standards and accountability legislation enacted in 1995. Students have several opportunities in 11th and 12th grades to pass exam. State accountability system rates schools based on Stanford Achievement Test-9th edition. Schools earning lowest rating must show improvement or ultimately face intervention. 1999 saw first state intervention in one school.	Fall 1998 agreement to implement a basic-skills test for new teachers no later than 2002, and eventually to add subject-matter testing. Fall 1998, schools of education will be classified on basis of their students' classroom performance and performance on teacher tests. Schools could lose the authority to certify teachers in certain subject areas if their records in those areas are consistently poor. Subject to implementation of new testing. Reading and teacher-training initiative, begun in late 1997 with private support, engages teacher training institutions with schools focused on reading. Initially limited to 80 schools, will be expanded to 200 schools in 2000-01 with state funding. Intent is to focus on math, science and technology in the future. From ACHE "Evaluation of the Alabama Reading Initiative: 1998-99." The initiative started in 1998					
AK				The Legislature passed a law in 1997 that directed the Department of Education to develop the Alaska High School Qualifying	1997 law requires new teachers to take the PRAXIS I exam. 1997 law requires institutions to meet NCATE standards.			See WICHE Policy Insights for tuition and student aid information. University of Alaska Board of Regents		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

State	1 Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	2 K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	3 Major Higher Education Initiatives	4 Major P–12 Initiatives	5 Teacher Quality Initiatives	6 Major Community College Initiatives	7 Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	8 Major Changes in Institutional Financing	9 New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	10 Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				Examination. In 1998, another law was passed that made the qualifying exam part of a greater system of accountability standards and assessment. The Quality Schools initiative requires schools to create development profiles for each child entering kindergarten or first grade; requires schools to adopt state-mandated academic standards in reading, writing, and math; requires third, sixth, and eighth grade assessments in reading, writing and math; requires schools to report to public; requires low-performing schools to develop school improvement plans. Starting in 2002, schools will be grouped into four categories of performance based on multiple student measures, and low-performing schools will be subject to intervention. The new law requires each high school student, beginning with the Class of 2002, to pass the Alaska High School Graduation Qualifying Exam. A new high school exit exam was piloted in 1999 and 2000. Sophomores are the				voted in December 1999 to award up to $1,350 per semester, or $10,800 over four years, to recent high school graduates who are academically talented and who enroll at the university to earn a degree. Program would focus on students who rank in the top ten percent of their graduating class.		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				first to be required to pass the exam to graduate in 2002. State is administering "benchmark" exams in grades three, six and eight, in 2000.						
AZ		Governor's proposed tax increase for education including funding both for K-12 and for higher education.	Governor's Task Force on Higher Education will make recommendations in fall 2000. Likely recommendation will call for reduced tuition at the community colleges as an incentive for students to attend these institutions and thereby take pressure off the universities.	State adopted new academic standards in 1996. New state exam (Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards–AIMS) measures proficiency against 1996 standards. Class of 2002 will be first required to pass AIMS exam to receive a diploma. Original target implementation of 2001 postponed by one year.	December 1998 rules require that new teachers pass two written exams on pedagogy and subjects that teachers intend to teach, in order to enter the classroom. Also, they must pass performance assessment on teaching skills to remain there. New standards have been adopted for teacher preparation. Teacher preparation has been opened to entities other than university-based schools of education (e.g., school districts, businesses, and charter schools)		See possible recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Education regarding community college tuition.		Board of Regents in June 2000 adopted proposal for Virtual University.	
AR				1999 law established the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program, which incorporates academic standards, professional development for teachers, and state tests for students in grades four, six and eight. Plan to be phased in over four years. Any school that fails to achieve expected levels of student performance will be placed on list			In February 2000, Arkansas legislators sought to limit access to the Arkansas Academic Challenge Scholarship program because of projected cost increases. The Governor's Distinguished Scholars program, created in 1997, pays the full cost of attendance, including tuition, room and board and mandatory costs, at public or private			State law requires the Arkansas Coordinating Board of Higher Education to evaluate its role and scope every five years. It should have done so in 1994, but it voted then not to tackle the task with the threat of a lawsuit hanging over it. In 1999, the evaluation was largely internal involving the college presidents, chancellors, faculty and staff.

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				of failing schools and will be required to work on an improvement plan. Failure to show improvement could lead to a school's takeover by the state. Beginning in 2003-04 school year, schools will be assessed based on students' test scores, attendance, graduation rates, school safety and teacher qualifications.			school of choice. To qualify, students must achieve a 32 on the ACT, or 1410 on the SAT, or be named a National Merit Finalist. More than 9,000 students successfully applied for the scholarships in the 1999-2000 academic year, nearly twice as many as the year before. The flood of new applications was attributed to a successful television advertising campaign for the scholarships, and to the state's decision to double the income limit to $70,000 for a family of three, for example. The higher education department found itself without nearly enough funds to fulfill its commitments. To do away with $3.8 million of the program's $8-million shortfall, the state Higher Education Coordinating Board voted in May 2000 to renege on its promise of bonuses for good grades.			
CA				Governor Davis' 1999 education reform initiative creates a school-performance index, provides additional funding for literacy training, and requires a graduation exit exam in 2004. New			Under a landmark agreement reached between Governor Davis and the California Legislature, state spending on need-based student aid was set to grow by $97 million—enough			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				provision would reward teachers in low-performing schools whose students show significant improvement on the state's new performance index, which is being phased in during the 2000-01 school year.			to support a 41 percent increase in the number of grants awarded in the 2000-01 academic year. In addition, the agreement provides for nearly doubling spending on the state's need-based aid program, to $1.2 billion, by 2006. Under the agreement, the awards would be guaranteed to every student who qualified, rather than depending on how much money was available in the budget. Senate Bill 1644 revamps the State's current statewide financial aid program, Cal Grant, creating an entitlement program guaranteeing a grant or scholarship award to future California high school graduates who demonstrate financial need and earn at least a C grade point average in their high school course work. Beginning in 2001, high school graduates with financial need and at least a B average would be eligible for a full-tuition grant at a state institution, or up to $9,700 at a private college in the state. Needy students who have at least a C average			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
							would be eligible for up to $1,550 to cover living expenses. In addition, the legislation provides grants for older students who are returning to college or enrolling for the first time. Senate Bill 1688 provides financial awards of up to $5,500 for college costs to those high school students who are the highest scorers on the state's standardized STAR examinations and on advanced placement examinations in mathematics and science. Program would provide $1,000 scholarships to students with high scores on a statewide standardized test (STAR), and $2,500 grants to students with high scores on Advanced Placement tests in math and science.			
CO		Colorado public institutions, by fall 2001, are to test the basic skills of their incoming freshmen and determine which students need extra help. The results will be grouped by school districts and used to help them adjust their high school curricula, if necessary, to cut	1999 reform legislation created pilot project to test the abilities of college sophomores at the state's public institutions. In the spring of 2000, seven Colorado institutions administered tests to assess the writing, reading, critical thinking and mathematical	SB 00-186, passed in April 2000, establishes a new school accountability system with school grading based on an expanded assessment program. New law will require each Colorado public high school junior, beginning in spring 2001, to take the	SB 154 (1999) requires all resident teachers to pass a basic-skills test by April 15 of their first year of employment. SB 154 eliminated state approval of all teacher-preparation programs as of July 1, 2001. To continue, teacher training programs must conform to new		State officials set new standards, as well, for students receiving Colorado merit-based scholarships. All new recipients, beginning in the 2000-01 academic year, will be required to maintain at least a 3.0 grade point average to be eligible for the aid in the subsequent	New performance funding policy.		

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		down on students' remedial needs.	reasoning abilities of some of their sophomores. In 2000-01, officials will try out different types of standardized tests and continue to weigh how the test results might be used to help assess institutions' core courses, and measure how well high schools prepared the students for college.	ACT college-entrance examination. The state will pay as much as $1 million a year to pick up students' registration fees.	standards to be set jointly by the state board of education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.		academic year. State policy changes in 2000 will shift resources to begin providing more aid to the state's neediest students rather than allocating smaller amounts of assistance to a wider group of people. Eligible low-income students in 2000 began receiving the new Governor's Opportunity Scholarships. The program aims to provide students whose families' incomes fall in the state's bottom quartile enough assistance so that they do not have to accrue debt by taking out loans for college. The Colorado General Assembly set aside $800,000 to increase access to higher education through another route. The money will be used for a rural education-access program, to begin in fall 2000, which will allow some two-year colleges in rural and mountainous areas to offer bachelor's degrees.			
CT				1996 mandate targeted significant proportion of state aid to poor and urban districts on literacy programs.	State board of education in 1999 approved a "Common Core of Teaching" replacing the 15 "competencies" used		Connecticut froze tuition at public institutions beginning in 1997, but because of Constitutional		The Legislature approved the establishment of a Waterbury campus of both the University of	Accountability in Higher Education Act of 1999 directs the state's public colleges and universities to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 23

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				and in 1998 launched the Early Reading Success program. 1999 law requires districts to revise policies to reduce social promotion. Over two-year period, the state's poorest and most urban districts are to provide additional instruction to all fourth and sixth grades who fail to meet performance goals on Connecticut's standardized tests. Students who still don't progress even after receiving help will be required to attend summer school or be held back a grade. Plan also calls for public listing of elementary and middle schools whose test scores are most in need of improvement. Those on the list must develop improvement plans. If actions do not yield improvements, the law authorizes the state to reconstitute or completely re-staff the school.	since implementation of the Education Enhancement Act of 1986. The common core is meant to guide teacher training and evaluation programs.		spending limitations that barred state funding to offset tuition, the state abandoned this freeze and agreed to increase spending on need-based aid for public-college students by about 30 percent in 2000-01. The state's public colleges, meanwhile, resolved to increase their tuitions by about four percent. Governor Rowland proposed Connecticut HOPE Scholarship Tax Credit and the Lifelong Learning Tax Credit in his 2000 State of the State message. (This was not enacted, as far as can be determined.)		Connecticut and the Connecticut State University System, which would jointly use the site to offer a limited selection of four-year programs intended to meet local business needs. Lawmakers appropriated about $5 million to begin to build a distance-education network linking all of the state's colleges, school systems and libraries.	develop benchmarks for improvement in areas such as graduation rates, minority-student access, and fee growth. Public Act 99-285 clarifies the major goals and expectations that Connecticut citizens have for their public system of higher education. The act charges the Higher Education Coordinating Council (HECC) with developing accountability measures for each constituent unit and each public institution of higher education. These measures must be approved by the BOG and used by the D of HE and each constituent unit in assessing progress toward meeting six identified goals. The BOG presented a progress report on the process on January 28, 2000.
DE				Accountability requirements enacted in mid-1990s are just now being implemented. State has been administering assessments in reading, writing and mathematics in grades three, five, eight and ten since	State rejected the Governor's educator-accountability law proposed in Fall 1999.		Proposal in 1999 for "HOPE-like" scholarship program died in state Legislature. Plan would have provided a free education to any student whose family earned $40,000 a year or less and who			

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				spring 1998. In 1999, the state administered social studies assessments in grades four, six, eight and 11. Students in grades three, five and eight will be required to meet the state standards in reading in order to advance to the next grade. Students in grades eight and ten will be required to meet state standards in math to advance. Students must pass the tenth grade math assessment to receive a high school diploma. Governor Carper's 2000 Legislative Agenda included raising student achievement by recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers, maximizing the impact of 10,000 mentors, and other initiatives. In March 2000, Governor agreed to delay for one year the mandatory consequences of testing in grades three, five and eight, and to delay for an additional two years (from 2002 to 2004) the graduation requirements. Student Standards bill, SB 182, was first enacted in 1997. Delaware also considered (and may have enacted) a			maintained a grade point average of at least 2.5 in high school. No major student aid proposals were enacted in the 2000 legislative session.			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				social promotion bill in 2000.						
FL	Major governance change creating a new structure effective January 2003. New structure would include a seven-member state board of education appointed by the governor, a commissioner of education appointed by the board of education, and chancellors for non-public and non-traditional education, community colleges, state universities and K–12 education. Each of the state universities would have a governing board appointed by the governor. A transition task force is overseeing implementation with deadlines for reports in March 2001, 2002, 2003 and a final report on May 1, 2003.	In February 2000, the Florida Board of Regents approved the Talented 20 initiative as alternative to affirmative action. Proposal required approval by the State Board of Education and Cabinet. Under previous policy, students had to have a 3.0 grade point average and take 19 required credits to get into a state university. Race could be considered in regular admissions and in alternative admissions, which were used when students didn't meet the minimum standards. Under the One Florida and Talented 20 rules, students in the top 20 percent of their graduating classes would be guaranteed admission. Students would still have to take the 19 credits, but their grades and college entrance test scores would not matter if they ranked in the top 20 percent of their high school class.		Governor Bush's A+ for education reform plan calls for students to receive a letter grade based primarily on their performance on state tests. Under the law, students in schools graded F in two out of four years may transfer to better public schools or use state-financed vouchers to pay private or religious school tuition. Schools earning A's are to be rewarded with extra money. New tougher state assessments (Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test) were phased in beginning in spring 1999. Tests were given to students in grades four, five, eight and ten for the first time in spring 1999. New policy (under development in 1999) to end social promotion. New law requires that schools tie student progression from one grade to the next to demonstrated proficiency in reading, writing, science and math. Also requires that schools provide those students who are held back with individual education plans.	1999 legislation increased entrance requirements and expanded types of data schools of education must report to enable identification of best practice. Also, legislation established committee on teacher education to recommend new curriculum requirements for state-approved teacher education programs to be completed in January 2000.		Florida Bright Futures, established in 1997. Maximum award: Academic: tuition, fees and book allowance. Merit: 75 percent of tuition and fees. Gold Seal Vocational: 75 percent of tuition and fees. First awards in 1997. Eligibility requirements: Academic: 3.5 grade point average in college preparatory courses; maintain a 3.0 grade point average in college to renew. Merit: 3.0 grade point average in college preparatory courses; maintain a 2.75 grade point average in college to renew. Gold Seal Vocational: 3.0 overall and 3.5 grade point average in vocational courses; maintain a 2.75 grade point average in postsecondary courses to renew.	Performance funding in place for community colleges and in process of implementation for State University System.		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

State	1 Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	2 K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	3 Major Higher Education Initiatives	4 Major P–12 Initiatives	5 Teacher Quality Initiatives	6 Major Community College Initiatives	7 Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	8 Major Changes in Institutional Financing	9 New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	10 Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
GA	Governor Roy Barnes' Education Review Commission, initiated in June 1999, reported at the end of 1999. Commission's recommendations led to enactment of major reform legislation, HB 1189, effective July 1, 2000. New law includes provisions related to both K–12 and higher education, although it focuses primarily on K–12. HB 1187 establishes a new Education Coordinating Council and Office of Educational Accountability. Ten-person council including Governor as chair brings to quarterly meetings the heads of the five public education departments, boards and offices: state superintendent of schools, and the chair of the state board of education; chancellor of the University System of Georgia and chair of the board of regents; commissioner of the Department of Technical and Adult Education, and chair of the board; executive director of the Professional Standards Commission, and chair of the board; and executive director of the Office	The Georgia P–16 Initiative is a comprehensive and collaborative statewide effort aimed at raising expectations and ensuring student success from preschool through postsecondary education. P–16 is a collaborative effort (begun in 1995 and first funded by the state in 1997) of the University System of Georgia (USG), the Department of Education, the Department of Technical and Adult Education, the Office of School Readiness, and the business community. At the state level, the P–16 council has led to agreements and recommendations related to college preparation curriculum, teacher preparation (see column on teacher initiatives), academic standards, testing, a linked student database, the University System Reading Consortial and technology in the classroom. Examples of P–16-related initiatives are: Performance Assessment for College and Technical School (PACTS) program, a standards-based assessment system	Beginning with the vision and guiding principles adopted by the Board of Regents in 1994, the University System of Georgia has pursued a consistent, coherent set of policy initiatives. Among these are the reform of missions for all institutions, stronger coordinated admissions requirements, partnerships between USG and K–12 schools, business, and other organizations, a partnership with DTAE, and the P–16 initiative.	Governor Roy Barnes' Education Review Commission, initiated in June 1999, reported at the end of 1999. Commission's recommendations led to enactment of major reform legislation, HB 1187, effective July 1, 2000. Prior to HB 1187, Georgia had established a Core Curriculum. 1998-99 was first year that teachers were expected to use the new curriculum. Assessments tied to the curriculum—in the form of the criterion-referenced competency tests—were to be given for the first time in spring 2000. Students in grades four, six and eight will be tested in English/language arts, reading and mathematics. Science test for grades three, five and eight, and the social studies test, to be given in grades three, five and seven, are still being developed and will be phased in. New K–12 accountability system established by HB 1187, including many of the provisions found in accountability laws in Florida, Texas, North Carolina and other	Board of Regents in 1998 approved ten principles and related actions for improving the quality of teacher education. Principles and actions are being phased in. Revised programs (undergraduate and graduate) must be in place for students admitted to the program beginning in fall 2000. Report of P–16 Council in June 1999 called for a qualified teacher in every public school classroom by 2006.	Agreement between the USG and the Department of Technical and Adult Education provides for improved coordination and articulation between the two systems, with the USG concentrating on general education and DTAE focusing on job-entry occupational instruction. HB 1187, effective July 1, 2000, reconstitutes the DTAE board and allows technical institutes to change name to "technical college." Institute must first get occupational degree-granting accreditation from SACS or COE or any other appropriate accrediting agency approved by the United States secretary of education.	HOPE Scholarships Maximum award: tuition, fees and book allowance up to $3,000. First awards in 1994. Eligibility requirements: 3.0 grade point average in high school for college preparatory curriculum and 3.2 grade point average for other curricula; maintain 3.0 grade point average in college to renew. Beginning in 2000 high school grade point average in core courses will determine eligibility. HB 1187 effective July 1, 2000, makes adjustments to HOPE: It removes cap on technical school students that currently cuts off HOPE after two certificates or diplomas or after two changes in program of study; sets initial grade point average for a junior in college receiving a PROMISE teacher scholarship at 3.2 instead of 3.6. For a full-time or part-time student, already having baccalaureate degree does not affect eligibility for PROMISE scholarship (to encourage "second career" teacher candidates);	Change in the USG budget policy since 1995-96 uses special funding as the leverage to advance the USG strategic plan and to address state priorities. Budget is divided into formula and non-formula components with the non-formula components deliberately linked to state priorities and policy initiatives consistent with the USG strategy plan. HB 1187 also changes the funding formula to move away from a totally enrollment-driven model. Enrollment-Driven Funding Formula For Technical Schools Funds now to be based on enrollment and cost factors (subject to appropriation).	Major technology initiatives to serve students and the state include, among others, GALILEO, the one statewide electronic library; Georgia EASY program, which allows high school students to research and apply online for any of the university system's 34 institutions.	Initiatives linking the USG to the state's economic development agencies and business community: Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (ICAPP); Information Technology Strategic Response Initiative; and Governor Barnes' YAMACRAW Mission, designed to make Georgia a leader in the microchip industry.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
	of School Readiness. Utilizes existing staff in the five departments and offices, together with staff from the Office of Education Accountability (OEA) and the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (OPB). Purpose is to improve public education through "seamless" coordination among the five education providers, from pre-K all the way through postsecondary; to get the most out of tax dollars by looking for ways to share facilities, equipment, personnel and other resources; to make it easier for students to transition from one to the other, align the curriculum so a student doesn't have to start over at each level; to foster state, regional and local cooperative groups; to help raise student achievement in all five by overseeing accountability through an Office of Education Account-ability; and to reduce rules and regulations in all five, cut paperwork, do more via the Internet, encourage mentoring programs.	being piloted in four local P–16 councils; and Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program (PREP) to identify and work with at-risk middle school students.		states. The measure sets up a system by which schools are to be graded from A to F based on their students' performance on state tests. Schools will be graded based on both their students' absolute test scores and on how much they have improved. Each year, teachers at schools awarded an A will receive $1,000 bonuses; those at B schools will get $500. D or F will trigger various forms of state intervention that will become increasingly severe over time. If a school receives poor grades for three or more years, for example, state education officials could order the removal of school personnel or give parents the option of transferring their children to another public school. The law also stipulates that students' achievement gains be considered in teachers' annual evaluations, and that educators with unsatisfactory evaluations be kept from moving on to the next step of the salary scale. The school performance results must be disaggregated with			removes so-called Pell offset requirement that previously penalized students who got both a federal grant, such as Pell, and HOPE.			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				respect to ethnicity, sex, socioeconomic status, disability, language proficiency, grade level, subject area, school and district.						
HI			2000 Legislative session approved an autonomy bill for the university system. As a result, voters will decide in the fall of 2000 if the Board of Regents should have constitutional authority over all decisions within the university system. Those decisions include some reforms passed in 1998 which would be placed in the state Constitution under the ballot measure—such as the university's power to keep tuition revenues and to hire its own counsel.	1999 law gives education officials authority to establish an accountability system including a state assessment system based on state standards and involving rewards and sanctions for schools based on their performance. Nevertheless, it could be five years before schools face any consequences. Performance Review Commission report found that state standards developed in late 1980s were not consistently implemented throughout the state. Report also emphasized lack of assessment system. An evaluation of the education system commissioned by the state superintendent identified core needs for improvement. In August 1999 the state board approved revised standards. Next step is development of assessment system. Hawaii Assessment Program of Outcomes piloted in 1999. Implementation in 2000-01 contingent on funding.						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
ID				First draft of standards for K–8 was due in January 2000. Previous standards-writing effort stalled. 1999 state appropriation for literacy plan for K–3. 1999 legislation outlines reading standards and assessments and calls for statewide testing of students twice a year. Summer programs for students scoring below grade level in reading. State board of education approved exit standards for students in grades 9–12 that were to be approved by the Legislature in 2000.	1999 legislation called for testing of K–8 teachers and administrators prior to certification.					
IL		P–8 Partnership for Education Excellence endorsed by the Illinois BHE in February 1999 is partnership of the Illinois Board of Education, Community College Board, and IBHE. Major initiatives include: (1) *College-Ready Kids* to increase the number of Illinois high school graduates who are well-prepared for and go on to college, reduce the number of Illinois college and university students who need remediation, and increase the number	In February 1999, IBHE approved strategic document, the *Illinois Commitment*, outlining six goals: (1) Higher education will help Illinois business and industry sustain strong economic growth; (2) Higher education will join elementary and secondary education to improve teaching and learning at all levels; (3) No Illinois citizen will be denied an opportunity for a college education because of financial need; (4) Illinois will increase the number and diversity of citizens completing	In 1999, state completed first round of testing using the Illinois Standards Achievement Test, an assessment designed to align more closely with state academic standards adopted in 1997. First year yielded significantly lower scores than previous assessments. To ease the transition, the state released percentage of students in which schools deemed not to have met state standards for proficiency rather than the raw scores. In addition, though the state will	See P–16 Partnership. Public Act 90-0548, signed into law by Governor Edgar in December 1997, establishes that teachers will be certified based on attaining knowledge and performance standards, establishes an induction period (though not a program) for newly prepared and hired teachers, distinguishes between an initial and a standard certificate, requires continuing professional development for certificate renewal,	A new law (2000) transfers the administration of the state's $48-million adult-education program from the State Board of Education (which oversees elementary and secondary schools) to the Illinois Community College Board. The changeover is scheduled to be complete by July 2001.		In February 1999, the IBHE refocused the budget development process to establish a close link between statewide strategic goals identified in the *Illinois Commitment* and budget recommendations, to implement statewide strategic goals and include performance measures and assessments, so that the entire higher education community and each institution can assess progress toward achieving goals, and to assess annually using	Illinois Century Network, established by Public Act 91-0021 in July 1999, is to be a single high-bandwidth telecommunications network that provides reliable communication links to and among Illinois schools, institutions of higher education, libraries, museums, research institutions, state agencies, units of local government and other local entities. Initiatives such as the Illinois Virtual Campus, Illinois Digital Academic Library, Illinois Community	Adult education (see 6).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		of students who earn a certificate or a degree and who do so on time; (2) *Classroom-Ready Teachers*, to increase the number and competence of newly prepared teachers, improve the knowledge and skills of beginning teachers, provide high quality and accessible professional development opportunities for already employed teachers, and increase the number of master teachers in Illinois schools; and (3) *Log-on Learning* to expand the use of technology to improve educational opportunities. Joint Education Committee (JEC) provides a means for collaboration among the Board of Higher Education, the Human Resource Investment Council, the Illinois Community College Board and the State Board of Education. Prairie State Exam is to be an exit exam given to high school students who are going to enter college and/or the workplace, and has been a major issue for joint deliberations (see K–12 initiatives).	training and education programs; (5) Illinois colleges and universities will hold students to even higher expectations for learning, and will be accountable for the quality of academic programs and the assessment of learning; and (6) Illinois colleges and universities will continually improve productivity, cost-effectiveness and accountability.	continue to offer assistance to low-scoring schools as in the past, the state will not issue an "early warning list" of low-scoring schools as they have in the past. Prairie State Exam, established by legislation in 1996 and under development by State Board of Education since then, is to be an exit exam given to high school students who are going to enter college and/or the workplace. Test will replace the ISAT and is to be given to students in the second semester of the junior year. Students will not be required to pass the test to graduate, but those who do will receive a special designation on their diplomas. Test is to be piloted in spring 2000 and used for the first time in 2001. Test, being developed by American College Testing (ACT), is to include three parts: (1) the traditional ACT exam, which many of the universities accept; (2) ACT Work Keys, which include reading for information and applied math; and (3) the Illinois learning standards, specifically with	and creates a "master certificate" to recognize the significant contributions of teachers who have earned certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The State Board of Education in 1999 adopted core standards for all teachers, content standards for specific areas of preparation, and requirements for continuing professional development.			specific measures of results and accountability.	College Online, and the Illinois Virtual High School, will use the network to expand access to education and training. The Illinois Virtual Campus (IVC), developed by the University of Illinois and inaugurated in 1999, is to be a gateway to distance learning in Illinois. More than 70 colleges and universities throughout Illinois have expressed their intent to list their courses and programs with the Illinois Virtual Online Catalog. Illinois plan includes partnerships with community colleges to create student support centers that will guide students to courses, offer technical assistance, provide access to computers, and ensure that no students fall through the virtual cracks in the student support system. Lake County Center. Subcommittee of Illinois BHE formed in 1998 to study the educational needs of Lake County—one of the fastest growing counties, and one without a four-year public institution. Study	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A SUMMARY OF STATE POLICY INITIATIVES IN HIGHER EDUCATION SINCE 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				writing, science content and social science.					recommended that a university center be approved. In 1999, the General Assembly and the Governor authorized and appropriated funds for the University Center of Lake County. The IBHE in 2000 authorized new center to be placed on the grounds of the College of Lake County in Grayslake. Approximately 12 schools and universities have opted to participate in the center.	
IN		Appointed and co-chaired by Governor Frank O'Bannon and Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Suellen Reed, Education Roundtable serves to improve education for Hoosier students. Comprised of equal representation from business/community and education, and additional representatives from the General Assembly, members are appointed for their commitment to improvement of the state of education in Indiana and as leaders in their respective fields. Meeting on an informal basis in 1998, the Roundtable was formalized through		Indiana has had standards for all subject areas for all grade levels since the late 1980s, but the quality and clarity of these standards needed to be improved. During fall 1999, the Department of Education undertook a major rewrite of the English/language arts and mathematics standards. Graduation Qualifying Exam (GQE), which is part of 10 ISEP+ test, was instituted in 1997. All students who expect to graduate in year 2000 and beyond must pass the GQE in order to receive a high school diploma. Students can qualify	Over the past ten years, the Indiana Professional Standards Board has completely overhauled the teacher induction, education and licensing requirements. New standards will be put into effect during the years 2000-04. Schools of Education will now be held accountable for the performance of their students and will have to certify that students know and are able to demonstrate the skills required of them for their specific content areas. Under the new system, teacher candidates will have to pass national exams in their content areas, and elementary teachers	Initiated in 1999, Indiana's community college system is being built on a partnership between Ivy Tech State College and Vincennes University. When fully operational, the system will offer community college curriculum at all 22 Ivy Tech sites and provide students with the opportunity to earn associate degrees that will be accepted by four-year colleges and universities.	The Twenty-first Century Scholars program is Indiana's GEAR UP program. It grants tuition scholarships for higher education at public or private institutions in Indiana to eligible young people who apply for the program and fulfill a commitment to the state. To be eligible, students must take a pledge including, among other points, that they agree to graduate from an Indiana high school with a high school diploma, achieve a cumulative high school GPA of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale, be enrolled in the eighth grade at an Indiana school accredited (or seeking			

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		legislation in 1999. Through Senate Bill 235, the Roundtable was established as an entity enlisted to make recommendations concerning education to the governor, superintendent of public instruction, General Assembly, and Indiana state Board of Education. The Roundtable was given additional responsibilities in House Bill 1750, which include assuming the duties formerly held by the state standards task force. Cooperative effort of Department of Education; State Board of Education, Chamber of Commerce, CHE, and governor's office to improve academic rigor for high school students led to adoption of "Core 40" —a list of courses and options that students should complete if they are considering higher education or to prepare for the world of work. Class of 1998 was first required to meet "Core 40."		on appeal or if they get C's in the Core 40.	will have to pass a reading test to show that they have the knowledge to teach reading. New teachers, through a two-year initial licensing period, will work with mentors and other specialists and will have to demonstrate, through portfolio reviews and in-class observations, that they can teach effectively. After the initial two-year period, teachers will have to develop personal growth plans that are tied to the needs of their students and will be assessed every five years through a portfolio review process in order to renew their teaching licenses. The Professional Standards Board has also put into effect policies that allow colleges and universities to establish non-traditional teacher education programs that lead to eligibility for an initial license.		accreditation) through Performance-Based Accreditation, be eligible for free or reduced-price lunches under the national school lunch program, or be eligible for free or reduced-price textbooks under the textbook assistance program. If a student does not receive other financial aid for tuition, the scholarship from the Twenty-first Century Scholars program will pay full tuition and fees at an Indiana public college. At an Indiana private or independent college, the scholarship will pay an amount equal to the average cost of full tuition at Indiana public colleges. If the student receives other financial aid for tuition, the Twenty-first Century Scholarship will be awarded only for the amount needed to cover the rest of tuition and fees. In 1999/2000, the Scholars program enrolled approximately 8,500 eligible eighth-grade students each year. Program administrators hope to raise enrollment numbers to at least 11,000 (approximately 70			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
							percent of eligible Indiana students) within the next five years. Increased outreach efforts are critical to meeting this goal.			
KS			The power of the nine-member Board of Regents was greatly expanded by legislation in 1999 that restructured higher education in the state. Three commissions were created within the board to govern the state's six universities; to oversee the community, vocational and technical colleges; and to coordinate the activities of public and private higher education.			(See major higher education initiatives on changes in the Board of Regents, and the board's additional responsibility for the coordination of locally governed community colleges and the postsecondary vocational-technical institutions.)				
KY		In 1998, the Council on Postsecondary Education and the State Board of Education created the P–16 Council, composed of three members each of the Board and the Council, along with the Commissioner of Education and the Council President. The P–16 Council has focused on the preparation and professional development of teachers, and on defining what is expected of students graduating from high school and entering	HB 1, enacted in 1997 as the result of the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education, led to major restructuring of the system, establishment of KCTCS, a new funding policy, and the Council on Postsecondary Education as the state's entity responsible for policy leadership and coordination of the state's postsecondary education system. 2020 Vision: Action Agenda for Kentucky's System of Postsecondary Education, adopted	Continued refinement of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) first enacted in 1989.	Task Force on Teachers made recommendations leading to major debate about reforms in the 2000 regular session.	HB 1, enacted in 1997, created the Kentucky Community and Technical College System by removing the community colleges from the University of Kentucky and transferring responsibility for the technical colleges to a new board.	Kentucky Educational Excellence Scholarships: Maximum award of $2,500 per year. First awards in 1999. Eligibility requirements: Eligibility and amount of award vary based on a student's grade point average in each of the four years of high school. For example, if a student achieves a 2.5 grade point average all four years of high school, he or she receives a total of $500 in each year of college. A student	HB 1 established new "base-plus" funding system. The base is determined by benchmarking, and funding beyond the base is established primarily through a series of strategic investment funds. SB 1, enacted in 2000, continues and broadens the purposes of an investment fund previously enacted in 1997 aimed at adult education and literacy.	Kentucky Commonwealth Virtual University established in 1997.	New economic development initiative enacted in 2000 with leadership responsibility assigned to the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE). Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy led to SB 1, enacted in 2000, setting forth a long-term strategy for improving the adult literacy in the state and assigning leadership responsibility to the CPE.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		colleges and universities. Stronger minimum admissions requirements. Reflecting new minimum high school graduation requirements, the Pre-College Curriculum (courses that students must take to be admitted unconditionally to Kentucky public universities) has been strengthened. The revised PCC, most of which applies to students who seek to enter four-year degree programs beginning in 2002, includes one more credit each in social studies and science, two credits in foreign language (effective 2004), one in arts appreciation, and half credits in health and physical education. In November, the Council approved a policy establishing a minimum standard for placing students in appropriate levels of courses in English, math and reading. The policy emphasizes placement based on what a student knows—not just the completion of certain courses in high school. It reflects comment by the institutions' chief academic officers	in 1998, provides the overall framework for the state's reform agenda.				who achieves a 4.0 grade point average all four years of high school receives a total of $2,000 per year in college. Annual bonuses of up to $500 will be based on ACT scores.			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		and Kentucky Department of Education staff.								
LA			Louisiana adopted major reform legislation in 1998, followed by approval of voters of amendments to the state Constitution. The legislation and constitutional amendment strengthened and clarified the authority of the Board of Regents and established the new Louisiana Community and Technical College System.			Following recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Community Colleges and Vocational-Technical Education, the state created the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, consolidating the state technical schools previously under the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education and the free-standing community colleges.	Louisiana Tuition Opportunity Program for Students, 1997; Maximum award and year of first award: Opportunity awards: tuition at public colleges; Performance awards: tuition at public colleges plus $400; Honors awards: tuition at public colleges plus $800; First awards in 1998. Eligibility requirements: *Opportunity awards: 2.5 grade point average in high school and ACT score at or above state average; maintain 2.3 grade point average in first year and 2.5 grade point average thereafter to renew. Performance awards: Top five percent of high school class, 3.5 grade point average in high school and minimum ACT score of 23; maintain 3.0 grade point average in college to renew. Honors awards: Top five percent of high school class, 3.5 grade point average			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
							and minimum ACT score of 27; maintain 3.0 grade point average in college to renew.			
ME				Maine's long-term educational reform effort centers on a state and local partnership to assure that all Maine students achieve the standards in Maine's *Learning Results*, a comprehensive set of guiding principles, content standards and performance indicators in eight content areas adopted in 1997.	Maine is redefining teacher certification standards to align with *Learning Results* standards, and is considering other policy changes to improve teacher quality.	The Community College Partnership of Maine was developed beginning in Fall 1999 by the Maine Technical College System and University of Maine System to expand access to community college programs. The General Studies program—started last fall at the Technical Colleges—offers foundation courses for many four-year baccalaureate programs as well as associate degree career programs. It is designed to transfer to four-year institutions. Statewide, 432 students—about twice as many as expected—have enrolled in the program since it began in fall 1999.	Maine Technical College system has frozen tuition levels for two years. University of Maine Board of Trustees has placed a high priority on restraining the rate of tuition increases and has debated a freeze comparable to the Technical College System.			
MD							Maryland Science and Technology Scholarship Program, 1998; Maximum award: $3,000 per year; Year of first award: 1999. Eligibility requirements: High school grade point average of 3.0, and must be seeking degree in high-demand fields identified by			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
							Maryland Higher Education Commission; maintain 3.0 grade point average in college to renew.			
MI							The Merit Award Scholarship, established in 1999. Graduating class of 2000 is first eligible class. Scholarship is merit-based: Eligibility is based on student achievement as demonstrated by performance on Michigan's standards assessment tests in mathematics, reading, science and writing. Student financial need is not a consideration. Students who meet eligibility requirements will qualify to receive the $2,500. The scholarship may be used for study at a university or college or for vocational/technical training at any approved postsecondary education institution. Program includes a middle school component. Beginning with the graduating Class of 2005 (i.e., seventh graders in the 1999-2000 school year), there will be an additional award of up to $500 for students who also perform well on the seventh and eighth			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
							grade MEAP tests in mathematics, reading, science and writing, for a total scholarship award of up to $3,000. The scholarship is intended to cover tuition and fees as well as other expenses such as room and board, books and supplies, transportation and daycare. Even if a student enrolls at an approved postsecondary education institution outside the state of Michigan, up to $1,000 may be applied toward eligible costs. Student may use the scholarship money for up to seven years after the student graduates or earns a GED. The program is funded with a portion of Michigan's share of the revenue from the multi-state settlement agreement with tobacco manufacturers. These funds are deposited in a special trust fund dedicated to the scholarship program.			
MO		The Missouri K–16 Coalition's report, Mathematics in Missouri, called for a higher degree of integration of math courses and skills	Blueprint for Missouri Higher Education (completed 1995, but originating in a report by the 1991 Business and Education	Legislation enacted in 1999 includes a variety of provisions related to reading, eliminating social promotion, establishing a	(See K–12 initiatives.)	In 1995, Senate Bill 101 directed the Coordinating Board for Higher Education to work in cooperation with the state Board of	The Coordinating Board organized all of its student financial assistance programs and services into one division, called	Funding for Results (FFR) initiative established in 1992 is a results-oriented performance-funding strategy that builds on planning	The Missouri Learners' Network will provide Missouri citizens greater access to postsecondary educational	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		across the K–16 spectrum. And the Knight Higher Education Collaborative/ College and University Presidents Roundtables resulted in action plans for promoting greater collaboration among institutions.	Partnership Commission). The Blueprint includes five strategic initiatives: institutional mission review and enhancement, student financial assistance, technology-based delivery systems, postsecondary technical education, and performance funding.	Missouri Teacher Corps, and loan forgiveness incentives for entering teaching. Prohibits State Board of Education from establishing "any single test or group of tests as a condition for graduation or a state-approved high school diploma."		Education to implement a comprehensive system of postsecondary technical education throughout Missouri. The following year, the Coordinating Board developed the State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education, a collaborative, five-year action plan for the statewide implementation of a technical education system. After three years of continuous appropriation by the Missouri General Assembly, the State Plan has shown results in geographic and programmatic access, program quality and improvement, and student success.	MOSTARS, in October 1997. MOSTARS' primary mission is to be a statewide "one-stop shop" for postsecondary assistance to Missouri citizens. By continuing to work in partnership with its constituents, MOSTARS serves as a key component in ensuring that students have the opportunity to access education beyond high school and to develop career paths. MOSTARS provides resources and assistance in four major areas: student financial assistance, customer service and support, early awareness and outreach, and default prevention and debt management. In 1999, the Missouri Commission on the Affordability of Higher Education's report, *Toward an Affordable Future*, outlined recommendations leading to the implementation of three new student financial assistance programs in 1999. The Advantage Missouri Program and the Missouri College Guarantee Program provided 2,920 additional students a total of	priorities. Through FFR, additional funds are generated for each public institution's budget, based on student and institutional performance. FFR has been refined periodically and will increasingly be linked to state priorities.	opportunities, and will help institutions promote their technology-mediated courses and programs. Institutions are being brought online at regular intervals. So far, three clusters have been brought online, bringing to 11 the total number of institutions. Forty-three colleges and universities have indicated their intent to participate.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
							$6.9 million during the 1999-2000 academic year. And in just the first few months of operation, almost $6.5 million was deposited into 2,139 Missouri Saving for Tuition (MO$T) accounts. The Advantage Missouri Program provides need-based, forgivable loans to eligible students pursuing identified academic programs that lead to employment in designated high-demand occupations in Missouri. The Missouri College Guarantee Program provides grants to the neediest students who have achieved the required ACT or SAT composite score, obtained the necessary high school grade point average, and participated in high school extracurricular activities to qualify for the program. The maximum annual grant award is based on the fees charged a full-time student at the University of Missouri-Columbia along with a standard book allowance determined by the Coordinating Board. The student's final award amount is			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
46							determined after all state and federal non-repayable need-based student assistance is deducted from the maximum annual award amount. During the 1999-2000 academic year, $4 million was distributed to 1,814 eligible students through the Missouri College Guarantee Program. The third new state program is the MO$T Program, which is managed under the direction of the MO$T Program Board and the Office of the State Treasurer. MO$T encourages participants to save for postsecondary educational expenses by offering a combination of federal and state tax incentives.			
NC	Governor Hunt has set forth the goal of making North Carolina's public schools *First in America* by the year 2010. The goals are the following: • High student performance • Every child ready to learn • Safe, orderly and caring schools • Quality teachers	(See column 1.) Vice president for university-school programs coordinates initiatives for the University of North Carolina (UNC) general administration. North Carolina Education Research Council provides research to support decision-making by the Education Cabinet and units of state government.	UNC strategic priorities include: Expanding access to the university; strengthening UNC's support of the public schools (See K–16 partnerships); adapting to the Information Age (technology); and building partnerships across the sectors of education, government and business. Priority on access focuses on expanding access to the university to	(See column 1, major reform at all levels) In 1996, the *ABCs of Public Education* created a comprehensive accountability system for the state's public schools, and the *Excellent Schools Act of 1997* ensured a high quality teaching force. These two acts provide major cornerstones of the *First in America* efforts. As a result of	(See columns 1, 2, 3 and 4.)	Community College System adopted strategic plan, 2001-03, on May 20, 2000, including 16 goals in the areas of workforce training, lifelong learning, quality and flexible programs and services, procuring and allocating resources, and leveraging the power of technology.	UNC strategic priorities emphasize affordability through maintaining historic low tuition and developing programs such as "Pathways" to inform families about the availability of higher education and financial aid, and supporting development of a state need-based student aid program. Task Force on Tuition Policy in		(See UNC strategic priorities.)	(See UNC strategic priorities.)

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
	and administrators • Strong family, community, and business support. The Education Cabinet is composed of the state superintendent of public instruction, the chair of the state Board of Education, the president of the university system, and the president of the North Carolina Community College System. In addition, the president of the North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities meets with the Cabinet. Each of the education sectors has been charged by executive order to develop the strategies and timelines necessary for the accomplishment of the above goals and priorities.	University-School Teacher Education Partnerships is a statewide strategy involving the UNC, school districts and communities in preparation and development of teachers, administrators and other education professionals. North Carolina TEACH is a comprehensive program designed to recruit, train, support and retrain highly skilled mid-career professionals with at least an undergraduate degree, who seek to enter the teaching profession. New minimum course requirements for university admission are in process of implementation. North Carolina Center for School Leadership Development is responsible for ongoing professional development of school personnel and board members. Other initiatives include Principals' Executive Program, Best Practices Center, North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching, and the North Carolina	reach beyond "traditional" college-age students and to accommodate a surge of high school graduates over the next decade. Key strategies will include targeted use of distance learning, new types of strategic alliances among sister campuses, with public schools and community colleges, as well as with business and industry. Also, emphasizing affordability through maintaining historic low tuition and developing programs such as "Pathways" to inform families about the availability of higher education and financial aid, and supporting development of a state need-based student aid program. (See column on community colleges.)	the *First in America* effort, all four education sectors will collaboratively develop and refine strategies that will continue to improve the public schools.			October 1998 recommended, among other points, that UNC maintain its commitment to low tuition, and that the UNC Board of Governors support the development of a need-based student financial aid program for UNC students. December 1999, Task Force on Student Financial Aid recommended the specific design of a need-based student financial aid program for UNC students who are North Carolina residents. Legislature approved establishing the new need-based program, and appropriated for UNC $6.3-million as a down payment on the $31.8-million program to help needy students. Long-standing policy of maintaining low tuition was debated in 1999-2000. In the end, the university system's Board of Governors agreed to raise tuition by nearly 40 percent over two years on the two flagship campuses, with smaller increases on the 14 other campuses. The increases come on top of a systemwide			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		Teacher Academy.					student-fee increase of eight percent, on average, also approved by the board.			
ND			North Dakota Roundtable completed report, *University System for the 21st Century*, for the Legislative Council Interim Committee on Higher Education. The report was accepted by the Legislative Council on May 25, 2000, and the State Board of Higher Education, executive and legislative branches are taking steps to implement the recommendations—including legislation to be considered in the 2001 session. The report includes 92 recommendations directed to the state Board of Higher Education, executive branch, Legislature, university system, campuses and the private sector. Recommendations focus on developing a new long-term financing plan and resource allocation mechanism, new accountability measures (performance and fiscal), increased fiscal and administrative flexibility balanced by accountability, decentralization of responsibility to campuses,					New long-range financing plan and resource allocation policies accepted by the Legislative Council Interim Committee on Higher Education based on North Dakota Roundtable Recommendations.	(See *University System for the 21st Century* report.) Recommendations call for the state Board of Higher Education to assume leadership in developing new delivery systems capable of making the capacities of the North Dakota University System accessible to all of North Dakota, including learning centers and distance delivery. Other recommendations to the executive branch and Legislature call for policy changes and support to put in place the necessary technology infrastructure.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
			redefining the leadership role of the Board of Higher Education, and aligning system policies with state priorities.							
OH									(See next column on new funds.)	The General Assembly agreed (2000) to establish two trust funds for higher education using the tobacco money that the state will receive annually until 2025. The purpose is to provide dollars to public schools and colleges for technology needs, including computers and infrastructure. In the larger of the two, about $1.8 billion will be dedicated to biomedical research and technology, as well as efforts to find commercial outlets for that work. Part of the research is expected to focus on tobacco-related illnesses, college officials said. The fund will be administered by a new, 23-member commission, overseen by the state's Board of Regents. Commission members will include the chancellor of the state system, state cabinet officials, and appointees of the governor and the General Assembly.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
OK		State Regents for Higher Education (2000) taking advantage of federal GEAR UP program to strengthen and deepen Regents' K–12 partnerships and initiatives. Initiatives include: GEAR UP (see student aid), Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System (OK-EPAS) targeted at grades five–12 in participating schools, OHLAP (see student aid), Smart Start for Brain Gain 2010, a tutoring and mentoring program, summer academies for math, science and multidisciplinary studies, core college curriculum and other programs.	1999 State Regents for Higher Education initiative, Brain Gain 2010, aims at increasing education attainment of Oklahoma population. Goals by 2010: 28 percent of Oklahoma population age 25 and older to hold a bachelor's degree or higher, ten percent to hold an associate degree. Strategies include: Enhancing student preparation for college, expanding information services, improving college and university graduation rates, keeping more Oklahoma graduates in state, and attracting college degree holders from outside the state. 1997 Citizens' Committee on the Future of Oklahoma Higher Education made recommendations on (1) technology, (2) markets, (3) economic development/ workforce development, (4) funding policy, and (5) administration and management. Implementation resulted in initiatives across all dimensions of the Regents' responsibilities (K–16 partnerships, student and	Legislation in 1999 established new high school graduation requirements for all students. Each student must complete an End-of-Instruction.(EOI) exam in English II, U.S. History, Biology I and Algebra I.			Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program (OHLAP), begun in 1996, is a scholarship program aimed at low-income families to help strengthen preparation for college. Required 17-unit core curriculum is two units above Regents' admissions requirements. Originally, income cap was $24,000. Cap was raised to $32,000, and then to $50,000 in 2000 legislative session. GEAR UP provides federal funding for direct and indirect services (scholarships, student and school improvement, human and financial resources for schools and public awareness). (See K–16 initiatives.) Citizens' Commission recommended that students pay one-third of the cost of education and that Regents have more authority to set tuition. No changes have been implemented as of mid-2000, and student share remains approximately 25 percent.	Oklahoma targets a percentage of its budget (8.3 percent of 2000 budget; eight percent for 2001) for Regents' priorities and initiatives. These funds have been used to support implementation of the initiatives arising from the Citizens' Commission recommendations.	Oklahoma has placed a major priority (through OneNet, the statewide network, and policy changes) on the use of technology and new modes of educational delivery to meet the educational needs of the state, and for other purposes. New provisions in Regents' policy: encourage competency-based learning; eliminate geographic service areas; establish a new learning cite policy to provide incentives for institutions to collaborate in providing services to under-served regions of the state; and provid funding for capital projects related to technology, and funding for use of technology for improved student services and information systems.	Economic development/ workforce development initiatives were core recommendations of Citizens' Commission. A total of $10.8 million has been placed in an economic development fund to be awarded to institutions, consistent with the approved plan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

State	1 Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	2 K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	3 Major Higher Education Initiatives	4 Major P–12 Initiatives	5 Teacher Quality Initiatives	6 Major Community College Initiatives	7 Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	8 Major Changes in Institutional Financing	9 New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	10 Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
			institutional financing, new modes of delivery, economic and workforce development, etc).							
SC							South Carolina Palmetto Scholars, 1996: Maximum award: $5,000; First awards in 1997. Eligibility requirements: Top five percent of high school class, a 3.5 grade point average and combined SAT score of 1200 (or ACT equivalent); maintain a 3.0 grade point average in college to renew. South Carolina Legislative Incentives for Future Excellence, 1998: Maximum award: $2,000 at four-year colleges; $1,000 at two-year colleges. First awards in 1998. Eligibility requirements: High school grade point average of 3.0 and SAT score of 1000 (or equivalent); maintain 3.0 grade point average and complete 30 credit hours each year in college to renew.			
SD		The Board of Regents has released the annual High School Feedback Report for	Major change in approach to setting priorities and linking priorities to the budget in 1997-98.	HB 1257 sets out Governor Janklow's Education Agenda 2000. The Department of	Starting in Fall 2000, all student teachers will be required to take a major field exit examination,			New funding policy established in 1997-98 includes performance targets and state policy		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		high school graduates entering Regental institutions in Fall 1997. Created in 1995, this report enhances communication between high schools and the public universities, provides high schools with information about their graduates' readiness for postsecondary education, and helps universities, high schools and parents work together to ensure that students are prepared to be productive in college. The Feedback Report is designed to help high schools and higher education identify areas where students need further preparation.	(See financing.) In January 1999, the Board of Regents approved recommendations for the System General Education requirements.	Education and Cultural Affairs will: (1) Develop best practices and standards to ensure that South Dakota students, by third grade, have learned fundamental skills in reading, math, language arts, science and technology, and by 12th grade have learned educational and personal skills to prepare them for life outside of school; (2) Establish the Advanced Reading Enhancement Program to improve the teaching and learning of reading skills in grades one and two; (3) Research and analyze demographics of the state's public education workforce and teacher vacancies; (4) Establish an Office of Educational Technology; (5) Examine teacher certification and streamline the alternative certification process; (6) Recommend actions to improve teacher preparation programs. Report due to governor, Legislature, and Board of Regents by Nov. 15, 2000. Citizens' Education Review Panel: The panel will identify the greatest assets of K–12	according to action taken by the South Dakota Board of Regents. The Regents, meeting on the campus of South Dakota State University, voted to impose the requirement that all undergraduate teacher education programs will test student teachers at the beginning of the semester in which they are teaching in local school classrooms.			goals. This was a change from previous policy of allocating funds to institutions based on student credit hours. Under the funding framework, each university has an annual base budget. This amount will remain stable from year to year, unless a university sees dramatic enrollment growth or decline. Each university contributes to five separate incentive funds. Each fund is tied to a state policy goal.		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A SUMMARY OF STATE POLICY INITIATIVES IN HIGHER EDUCATION SINCE 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	**Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels**	**K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level**	**Major Higher Education Initiatives**	**Major P–12 Initiatives**	**Teacher Quality Initiatives**	**Major Community College Initiatives**	**Major Policy Changes in Student Financing**	**Major Changes in Institutional Financing**	**New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives**	**Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives**
				education in South Dakota, identify the challenges and obstacles to quality education, and recommend actions for the schools and Legislature to consider.						
TX		Joint committee between the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Texas Education Agency has been expanded to form a K–16 council involving the lieutenant governor, business leaders, public and independent institutional leaders, legislative and gubernatorial staff.	"Closing the Gaps: Participation, Success, Excellence and Research," is a new state plan under development in July 2000 by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.	Governor Bush's education reform agenda emphasizes that every student should be able to read by third grade. In addition, other measures strengthening assessment and accountability have been enacted since 1997. Texas students take the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) exams in grades three, eight and ten. The exam will be expanded to grades nine and 11 in the 2002-03 school year. Scores are combined with attendance and dropout rates to determine school and district accreditation ratings. Schools are rated Exemplary, Recognized or Acceptable. Schools are qualified for a TSSAS award if at least 45 percent of all students, and each student group (including each racial/ethnic group) passed each section of the TAAS, had a dropout rate of six percent or less, and	New state-designed teacher-evaluation program, Professional Development Appraisal System, was implemented in 1997-98 school year. PDAS includes one criterion related to the teacher's school state rating. A similar model for principals' evaluations took effect in 1998-99 school year. A plan for superintendents is to be in place in 2000. Under rules implemented in fall 1998, university teacher-certification programs are rated on their graduates' scores on certification exams. Low-performing programs will be visited by technical-assistance teams. While schools will receive credit for improved results, habitually low performers will lose their state accreditation. In 1999, eight of the state's 87 teacher-preparation programs were rated "accredited—under review" because of the high number of their students who		Toward EXcellence, Access, & Success (TEXAS) Grant Program enacted in 1999 provides grant of money to enable well-prepared eligible students to attend public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education in Texas. To be eligible, students must be Texas residents, graduate from a public or accredited private high school in Texas no earlier than fall 1998, complete the recommended or advanced high school curriculum or its equivalent, have financial need, have applied for any available financial aid or assistance, enroll at least part-time in an undergraduate degree or certificate program, and not have been convicted of a felony or a crime involving a controlled substance. Legislature funded the program at $100 million for the biennium. This compares with the state funding for			Law enacted in 1997 and effective fall 1998 provides automatic admission to students who graduate in the top ten percent of their high school class. Law provides option for institutions to admit top 25 percent of high school classes, and defines other factors that can be taken into consideration in admissions. Initiative affects primarily students seeking admission to the institutions with competitive admissions: UT Austin, Texas A&M and College Station.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				had an attendance rate of at least 94 percent. Additionally, the school must be ranked in the top 25 percent of its unique comparison group in both reading and math. 790 schools qualified for a TSSAS award in 1998-99. In 1999, a new law was enacted mandating that the exit level test be moved from grade ten to grade 11. The new grade 11 exit level test will assess students in English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. To be eligible to receive a diploma from a Texas public high school, a student must pass all four of these subject area tests. Students scoring above a certain level may be exempted from the TASP, the current assessment required to be passed before admission to upper division.	failed the state's certification test.		need-based aid for a single year (1998-99) of $66.6 million. Students are eligible to receive an amount equal to tuition and fees at a public university, community or technical college. Eligibility continues for maximum of 150 semester credit hours or for six years, whichever occurs first, provided the student maintains academic standards. Standards are set by institutions for the first year, and in subsequent years students must complete 75 percent of the hours taken in the prior semester, plus maintain an overall grade point average in college of at least 2.5. Plan is expected to provide full-tuition scholarships to about 20,000 students each year.			
UT		Master Plan 2000 calls for strengthening the Public Education/Higher Education Joint Liaison Committee, to provide strengthened oversight of areas that are shared responsibilities of the two sectors (e.g., teacher	Master Plan 2000. (See other columns.)	HB 177 enacted in March 2000 phases in the assessment tools, or tests, to measure if schools and students are achieving. The state Office of Education will recommend a tenth grade basic skills competency test, and a direct writing assessment for grades six and	Joint agreement—involving the Board of Regents, State Board of Education, deans of education schools—that all schools of education will meet NCATE accreditation standards, even if they do not seek NCATE accreditation.	Regents Master Plan 2000 called for a study committee to make recommendations in 2000 to resolve continuing issues regarding responsibility for applied technology education, i.e., the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents vs. Board of Education. A	Faced with the challenge of financing accelerating demand for higher education, Utah is considering a new tuition and student financing policy that would potentially increase tuition at the baccalaureate/ university campuses and decrease tuition	Master Plan calls for a small portion of funding to be allocated on the basis of performance. Also recommends that funding formula fund current as well as new students. As of mid-2000, this recommendation had not been implemented, but	Reflecting Governor Leavitt's priorities, Utah places a major priority on technology and open/distance learning as a means to provide place-bound adults, rural areas of the state, and students (e.g., secondary students who are concurrently	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A SUMMARY OF STATE POLICY INITIATIVES IN HIGHER EDUCATION SINCE 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		education and applied technology education). Utah is placing a major emphasis on concurrent enrollment of secondary school students in higher education through courses offered at high schools, at campuses and through open/distance learning. In 1999/2000, 20,000 students were enrolled concurrently. Increase in concurrent enrollment has not decreased ACT taking (Utah is at very high rate compared to other states). Governor Leavitt (as illustrated by New Century Scholars program) (See student aid.) is stressing acceleration of transition to higher education, and the increase of the proportion of high school students who obtain an associate degree prior to or shortly after high school graduation.		nine. The Office of Education also will develop an assessment method to uniformly measure statewide performance in mastering basic skills. The Legislative Task Force on Standards and Accountability will work with the Board of Education to establish benchmarks for student achievement. They also will work to develop intervention strategies to help schools that are falling behind.		legislative study committee (composed entirely of legislators) was examining the issue in mid-2000.	at the community college level. No action as of mid-2000. New Century Scholarship, enacted in 1999 (SB 90), provides 75 percent tuition scholarships to students who achieve a two-year associate degree by the September following their graduation from high school. Intent is to provide incentives for students to accelerate their learning. It is estimated that students who take advantage of this program could generate a $65,000 benefit in combined tuition savings and income from earlier entry into the workforce. In addition, the scholarship motivates high-achieving students to better utilize time and available resources in high school. It also partially reduces state-funded capital facility needs in higher education, benefits economic growth by giving students a jump-start on higher education, allowing them to enter the workforce earlier, and reduces student tuition and other personal college-related	the intention is to pursue this in future years. Board of Regents prepares an annual accountability report on performance that could be used as the basis for determining performance funding.	enrolled) with ways to gain access to higher education and accelerate their progress toward a degree. Regents Technology and Distance Learning Initiative has led to widespread applications of technology to student services, library and information systems, and for facilitating student access to resources at institutions throughout the state.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
							expenditures. Students who receive their associate degree at or near the time they receive their high school diploma will receive the New Century Scholarship and enter a university as a junior. The state-funded scholarship provides about $3,400 for two years of college or university. It is estimated that the cost of the scholarship can be almost entirely offset by reduced higher education funding. In the first year (2000), only 13 scholars were selected, but this number is expected to increase significantly in subsequent years.			
VT			Vermont Commission on Higher Education Funding (a panel of college representatives, legislators and other state officials, established by the General Assembly in April 1998) recommended to the Legislature, and the legislature agreed in 1999, to establish a multiyear compact to provide public colleges with predictable growth in their state aid, and for public institutions and the Vermont Student Assistance							

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
			Corporation. The public colleges, in turn, had pledged to work more closely with the state's public schools and to do more to promote economic development. The budgets approved for 1999-2000 and 2000-01 included a seven percent increase in funding to reflect this commitment. The budget that state lawmakers adopted for the 2000-01 fiscal year called for seven percent gains in support for the University of Vermont, the five-campus Vermont State Colleges System and the Vermont Student Assistance Corporation, which provides financial aid.							
WA			HECB Master Plan completed in January 2000.	After a decade of developments in education reform, 1999 Legislature enacted SSB 5418, K–12 Accountability and Assistance Legislation, which resulted from recommendations made by the Accountability Task Force that was established by the Washington Commission on Student Learning. Law establishes Academic Achievement and Accountability			In 1999, Washington State created a college Promise Scholarship program for students from low- and middle-income families who achieve excellent academic records throughout their high school careers. The scholarship was available for the first time to Washington high school seniors graduating in the class of 1999. Scholarship is available to eligible			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				Commission, including the superintendent of public instruction or designee, and eight members appointed by the governor. Commission duties are to: (1) adopt and revise performance improvement goals in reading, writing, science and mathematics, as the commission deems appropriate; (2) identify the scores students must achieve in order to meet the standards on the Washington Assessment of Student Learning; (3) adopt criteria to identify successful schools/districts; (4) adopt criteria to identify schools/districts in need of assistance, and those in which significant numbers of students persistently fail to meet state standards; (5) identify schools/districts in which state intervention measures will be needed, and identify a range of appropriate intervention strategies. This shall occur only after the Legislature authorizes a set of intervention strategies, and not before June 30, 2001; (6) identify performance incentive systems;			applicants for two years, subject to the availability of funding. Eligibility: Be designated by their Washington high school as being in the top 15 percent of the 2000 graduating class, or the top ten percent of the 1999 graduating class; have a family income of no more than 135 percent of the state's median for the year in which they graduated (about $77,600 in 1999-2000 for a family of four); attend an accredited public university, community or technical college, independent four-year college, or private vocational school in the state of Washington at least half-time; and not pursue a degree in theology. For the 2000-01 academic year, the maximum value of the scholarship is $1,641; however, the exact value depends on the number of eligible applicants. All completed applications received by the deadline and determined eligible will receive the same award. Scholarships are disbursed each term, on a per-term basis, from fall through spring, and			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				(7) annually review the assessment reporting system; and (8) by September 2000, recommend accountability policies, including state intervention strategies for schools/districts in which low performance persists over an identified period of time. The commission is to consider multiple indicators, including mobility, poverty, dropout rates and post-high school indicators; additional assistance measures; and rewards for successful schools/districts. The State Board of Education started its review process of state minimum graduation requirements in 1998 to align these with the state's ongoing education reform effort. The fundamental question is: What do all students statewide need to know and be able to do, at a minimum, in order to graduate from high school? In Fall 2000, the Board is addressing the following goals: to align the statewide minimum high school graduation requirements with the goal of the basic education act under			are sent directly to the school where the student is enrolled. 2000 Legislature approved $2.4 million on top of $9 million they already had promised for the state's merit-scholarship program in 2000-01. The extra dollars allowed state officials to increase the maximum award to near the level of community-college tuition, about $1,641. Goals of the Washington State GEAR UP Project, established in 1998, are to: provide comprehensive early intervention services and financial assistance to low-income and academically at-risk students; increase academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of participating students; increase educational expectations of participating students; increase student and family knowledge of postsecondary education options and financing; increase the enrollment rate of participants in postsecondary education; and establish effective			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
				RCW 28A.150.210—"provide students with the opportunity to become responsible citizens, to contribute to their own economic well-being and to that of their families and communities, and to enjoy productive and satisfying lives"; to assure that all the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) are taught in the high school curriculum; to assure that students are aware of the connection between their education and possible career opportunities.			educational partnerships among families, schools, institutions of higher education, local organizations and businesses, state educational service agencies, and state and local governments. Includes two components: GEAR UP state and partnership coordination project and GEAR UP scholarship project. The coordination project intends to: expand statewide capacity, and improve teaching and learning to prepare more disadvantaged students for postsecondary study; establish critical links between local K–12 schools, the various sectors of higher education, state and local governments, businesses, community organizations and statewide educational outreach organizations; develop and implement effective curricula and early intervention programs for students, families and schools that can be replicated across the state and nationally.			
WV		New Higher Education Policy	SB 653, enacted in the 2000 Legislature,		SB 653 establishes a state task force on	(See changes in SB 653.)	Provisions of SB 653 related to	SB 653 calls for a "base plus" funding		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Summary of State Policy Initiatives in Higher Education Since 1997/98

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State	Major Reform Initiatives, All Education Levels	K–16 Initiatives at State/System Level	Major Higher Education Initiatives	Major P–12 Initiatives	Teacher Quality Initiatives	Major Community College Initiatives	Major Policy Changes in Student Financing	Major Changes in Institutional Financing	New Delivery Systems, Technology and Distance Learning Initiatives	Other Major Higher Education Policy Initiatives
		Commission established by SB 653 includes the secretary of education and the arts and the superintendent of public instruction as ex officio voting members with an explicit legislative intent that the new Commission take a K–16 approach to policy formulation.	restructures the state's higher education system. The statute calls for a six-year compact linking higher education to the future of West Virginia's economy and quality of life. Elements of the plan include a new funding system, strengthened provisions for community and technical colleges, and a new West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission—a policy leadership/ coordinating entity to replace the two previous governing boards. Governance is decentralized to the institutional level, while policy leadership in pursuit of the public agenda is strengthened.		teacher education to undertake a thorough review of current policies for preparation of teachers.		community and technical colleges likely will lead to lower tuition rates for previous "component" community colleges that currently charge four-year rates for community college students.	system, moving away from an enrollment-driven formula to a policy that establishes base funding through a benchmarking process, and providing for the allocation of most new resources in accordance with institutional compacts that reflect state priorities.		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

About the Author

Aims McGuinness, a senior associate with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), specializes in education policy and governance. He initiated the ECS *State Postsecondary Education Structures Sourcebook,* and is a principal contributor to the December 1997 edition. He is author of several papers on university systems, including "Perspectives on the Current Status and Emerging Issues for Public Multi-Campus University Systems," Association of Governing Boards Occasional Paper (1991), and "A Model for Successful Restructuring," T. MacTaggart, ed., *Restructuring Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996).

He has an MBA from The George Washington University and a Ph.D. in social science from the Maxwell School for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)

The mission of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) is to help institutions and agencies of higher education improve their management capability. Through its 30 years of service to higher education, NCHEMS has been committed to bridging the gap between research and practice, by placing the latest management concepts and tools in the hands of college and university administrators. NCHEMS was founded in 1969 as a program within the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). Subsequently, NCHEMS became a private nonprofit organization in its own right, preeminent as a national center both conducting and translating research to meet the needs of practicing administrators.

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education works to strengthen America's future by increasing opportunity and achievement for all who aspire to higher education. As an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, the National Center promotes public policies that enhance Americans' opportunities to pursue and achieve high-quality education and training beyond high school. Formed in 1998, the National Center is not affiliated with any institution of higher education, with any political party, or with any government agency. It is supported by a consortium of national foundations that includes The Pew Charitable Trusts and The Ford Foundation.

The National Center publishes:

- ★ Reports and analyses commissioned by the National Center,
- ★ Reports and analyses written by National Center staff,
- ★ NATIONAL CENTER POLICY REPORTS that are approved for release by the National Center's Board of Directors, and
- ★ *CrossTalk*, a quarterly publication.

All National Center publications are available at www.highereducation.org. Single copies of most of these publications are also available from the San Jose office of the National Center. Please FAX requests to 408-271-2697 and ask for the report by publication number. *Measuring Up 2000* is available by calling 888-269-3652; single copies are $25.00.

San Jose Office: 152 North Third Street, Suite 705, San Jose, California 95112
Telephone: 408-271-2699 • FAX: 408-271-2697
Email: center@highereducation.org • Web site: www.highereducation.org

Washington Office: 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202-822-6720 • FAX: 202-822-6730

Reports and Analyses Published by the National Center

98-1 *Concept Paper: A National Center to Address Higher Education Policy*, by Patrick M. Callan (March 1998).

98-2 *The Price of Admission: The Growing Importance of Higher Education*, by John Immerwahr (Spring 1998). A national survey of Americans' views on higher education, conducted and reported by Public Agenda.

98-3 *Organizing for Learning: The View from the Governor's Office*, by James B. Hunt Jr., Governor of North Carolina and Chair of the National Center (June 1998). An address to the American Association for Higher Education concerning opportunity in higher education.

98-4 *Tidal Wave II Revisited: A Review of Earlier Enrollment Projections for California Higher Education*, by Gerald C. Hayward, David W. Breneman and Leobardo F. Estrada (September 1998). Finds that earlier forecasts of a surge in higher education enrollments were accurate.

98-5 *The Challenges Facing California Higher Education: A Memorandum to the Next Governor of California*, by David W. Breneman (September 1998).

98-6 *Federal Tuition Tax Credits and State Higher Education Policy: A Guide for State Policy Makers*, by Kristin D. Conklin (December 1998). Examines the implications of the new federal income tax provisions on students and their families.

98-7 *Higher Education Governance: Balancing Institutional and Market Influences*, by Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Kathy Reeves Bracco, Patrick M. Callan, and Joni E. Finney (November 1998). Describes the structural relationships that affect institutional efficacy in higher education, and argues that effective state policy achieves a balance between institutional and market forces.

98-8 *The Challenges and Opportunities Facing Higher Education: An Agenda for Policy Research*, by Dennis Jones, Peter Ewell, and Aims McGuinness (December 1998). Argues that due to substantial changes in the landscape of postsecondary education, new state-level policy frameworks must be developed and implemented.

99-1 *Taking Responsibility: Leaders' Expectations of Higher Education*, by John Immerwahr (January 1999). Reports the views of those most involved with decision-making about higher education, based on a survey and focus groups conducted by Public Agenda.

99-2 *South Dakota: Developing Policy-Driven Change in Higher Education*, by Mario Martinez (June 1999). Describes the processes for change in higher education that government, business and higher education leaders are creating and implementing in South Dakota.

99-3 *State Spending for Higher Education in the Next Decade: The Battle to Sustain Current Support*, by Harold A. Hovey (July 1999). This fiscal forecast of state and local spending patterns finds that the vast majority of states will face significant fiscal deficits over the next eight years.

00-1 *A State-by-State Report Card on Higher Education: Prospectus* (March 2000). Describes the National Center's forthcoming state-by-state report card on higher education.

00-2 *Great Expectations: How the Public and Parents—White, African American and Hispanic—View Higher Education*, by John Immerwahr with Tony Foleno (May 2000). This report by Public Agenda finds that Americans overwhelmingly see higher education as essential for success. Survey results are also available for the following states:

- 00-2b *Great Expectations:* How Pennsylvanians View Higher Education (May 2000).
- 00-2c *Great Expectations:* How Floridians View Higher Education (August 2000).
- 00-2d *Great Expectations:* How Coloradans View Higher Education (August 2000).
- 00-2e *Great Expectations:* How Californians View Higher Education (August 2000).
- 00-2f *Great Expectations:* How New Yorkers View Higher Education (October 2000).
- 00-2h *Great Expectations:* How Illinois Residents View Higher Education (October 2000).

00-3 ***Measuring Up 2000: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education*** (November 2000). This first-of-its-kind report card grades each state on its performance in higher education. The report card also provides national highlights, comprehensive profiles of each state and brief states-at-a-glance comparisons. Single copies are available for $25.00 by calling 888-269-3652. Discounts are available for larger orders.

00-4 *Technical Guide Documenting Methodology, Indicators and Data Sources for Measuring Up 2000* (November 2000).

00-5 *Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: A Supplement to Measuring Up 2000*, by Peter Ewell and Paula Kies (December 2000). National survey of state efforts to assess student learning outcomes in higher education.

00-6 *Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education: A Supplement to Measuring Up 2000*, by Aims McGuinness, Jr. (December 2000). Highlights education initiatives that states have adopted since 1997/98.

www.highereducation.org

152 North Third Street, Suite 705, San Jose, California 95112 • Telephone: 408-271-2699 • Fax: 408-271-2697
Email: center@highereducation.org • Web site: www.highereducation.org

1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 310, Washington, DC 20036 • Telephone: 202-822-6720 • Fax: 202-822-6730

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").